

And this is the platform on which the Congress must build its future attitude toward riots.

We cannot let the riots turn us away from the unfinished business of America.

We cannot let the riots turn us away from supporting President Johnson's excellent urban programs to transform America.

We cannot let the riots blind us to the accomplishments of the past and our hopes of the future.

We now have an unparalleled opportunity to restore faith and peace among the citizenry.

Let us do it now.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Plea for Reason—and Justice," published in the New York Post of July 27.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A PLEA FOR REASON AND JUSTICE

Four Negro leaders who have long fought the battle for justice have issued an appeal that deserves to be heard in the black ghettos, in the white suburbs, in the halls of Congress—by every segment of the nation—if we are to resume the quest for equality and end the futile turmoil in the streets.

"There is no injustice which justifies the present destruction of the Negro community and its people," declared the statement signed by Martin Luther King Jr., A. Phillip Randolph, Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young Jr. They added:

"We call upon Negro citizens throughout the nation to forego the temptation to disregard the law. This does not mean that we should submit tamely to joblessness, inadequate housing, poor schooling, insult, humiliation and attack. It does require a redoubling of efforts through legitimate means to end these wrongs and disabilities. We appeal not only to black Americans, but also to our fellow white citizens, who are not blameless . . . The 90th Congress has exhibited an incredible indifference to hardships of the ghetto dwellers."

In cold figures, the "indifference" amounts to this: the projected urban anti-poverty allocation has been more than halved by the Administration, and is now only \$1,000,000,000. Congress has shown signs of cutting it still further. Vietnam war spending has also cut deeply into other domestic programs—primarily school aid—which could help answer the needs of the lower depths.

But, as the four leaders assert, "the riots have not contributed . . . to the eradication of these just complaints."

We echo their urgent words: "No one benefits under mob law. Let's end it now!" Then let us try to begin anew the fight for equity and decency that cannot be won by wild looting, aimless lawlessness—or smug apathy.

U.S. SALES OF WEAPONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial which appeared in the July 24, 1967, edition of the *Charleston, W. Va., Gazette*, entitled "United States Can't Honestly Seek Peace, Sell Weapons, Too."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

UNITED STATES CAN'T HONESTLY SEEK PEACE, SELL WEAPONS, TOO

It stands to reason that a Nasser armed to the teeth with planes, tanks, guns and

ammunition is going to be more belligerent and more inclined to make warlike moves against a neighbor (such as closing the Gulf of Aqaba) than a Nasser without arms but with a good supply of agricultural equipment to keep his people busy.

It is equally logical that in underdeveloped nations, where the masses are ill fed, ill clothed, ill housed, and largely illiterate, their leaders would serve better by upgrading the economy and aiding humanity than by making war, which they can do only if they have the armaments.

Nasser is mentioned only by way of example, since he was involved in the latest war to break out, and the same could be said about other leaders on a number of continents.

It is not surprising, therefore, that members of the U.S. Senate, among others, are concerned with the U.S. military aid program as a threat to international peace.

Unquestionably, as the major arms supplier of the Arab states, the Soviet Union bears a large share of responsibility for the Middle East war, even though most of its investment wound up as useless hardware in the desert. But American hands are anything but clean, for our own government also fed the Middle East arms race which finally erupted in predictable war.

As Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, noted in a recent Senate speech on "Arsenal Diplomacy," the U.S. has granted \$322 million in military aid to the Arab states since World War II, while selling Israel \$28 million in arms.

Church viewed President Johnson's call for reporting to the United Nations of arms shipments to the area as a constructive proposal, but said it will not stanch the flow of arms to the Middle East. As a second step back from the brink, he urged that the U.S. make very effort to reach agreement among the suppliers of arms to the region—the great powers and notably Russia—on an arms embargo or a stringent arms limitation applicable to Arab and Israeli alike.

Certainly, for the future peace of the Middle East, it is obvious that Russia and the U.S. must agree to refrain from fueling a new arms race there. It is also self-evident that even without such an agreement, we have nothing to gain from further arms shipments to the Arabs. And surely the time has come to revise the whole policy of "arsenal diplomacy" which has made our country the dominant supplier of weapons to the world.

Church had some interesting, even frightening, figures to offer on the subject.

"In the eyes of much of the world," he said, "the United States seems more intent on furnishing swords than plowshares. During the past 17 years, we have bestowed on foreign governments \$8 billion in military vehicles and weapons, \$7 billion in aircraft, \$5 billion in ammunition, \$2 billion in ships, \$2 billion in communications equipment, \$1.5 billion in missiles and \$3 billion in other supplies. Services granted in the form of base construction, training repair, and spare parts amounted to an additional \$8 billion, for a staggering total of \$37 billion dispensed abroad since 1950."

As if to augment these massive gifts of arms, Church said the Defense Department is now engaged in a mushrooming sale campaign. Direct sales to foreign governments already exceed \$16 billion, while Pentagon officials anticipate orders worth another \$15 billion in the next decade.

"Today," said Church, "the federal government is the principal arms dispenser of the world; giving away, advancing credit, and promoting the sale of a volume of arms more than six times that of our nearest rival, the Soviet Union."

One broad justification for serving up American military hardware on a global

platter, much of it to countries far removed from Communist neighbors, is that it serves to bolster resistance to subversion from within.

But, said Church, "Vietnam is a poignant example of the failure of American guns to create loyalty out of fear and distrust. Massive injections of U.S. weapons, ammunition, equipment, and supplies failed to turn the tide against the insurgents. Our own troops had to be summoned and the war converted into an American engagement."

Another argument for the sale of the wares of war is that it helps to erase our balance of payments deficits.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee sees it differently: "The U.S. balance of payments is not in such perilous condition that it has to be salvaged by taking blood money from poorer countries. If we turn down every sales request for useless military equipment to nations which cannot afford such expensive baubles, the effect on our balance of payments would scarcely be noticed."

Church also points out that foreign armies are a risky investment and that we pay a heavy political cost for supporting them, adding:

"In any poor country of Asia, Africa, or Latin America, where there is an unreasonable concentration of wealth the army is usually the hate symbol of the status quo. Military governments, however stable they may appear, tend to be brittle as well as repressive."

As Church sees it, the greatest danger to world peace—assuming we can prevent the war in Vietnam from widening into a world war—is from some regional dispute igniting into a conflagration which spreads out of the control of those who supplied the arms which touched it off.

The United States should get out of this dirty business of giving or selling arms to start wars, and should push for U.N. action to control regional arms races. Then we could talk in good conscience about world peace.

CARMICHAEL STATEMENTS IN CUBA GO BEYOND FREE SPEECH

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the statements of Stokely Carmichael in Cuba, making threats against President Johnson, British Prime Minister Harold Wilson, and other high U.S. officials, run far beyond the reasonable limits of freedom of speech.

I have long been concerned about the operations of the Central Intelligence Agency and have studied its operations most carefully, but his assertions that "the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency has international license to kill, and if the CIA continues to assassinate fighters and guerrillas, vengeance must be taken against Western leaders," are wholly without substance and can serve only to prejudice the proper and defensible intelligence activities of the U.S. Government.

HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I submitted today to the Senate Committee on Appropriations regarding the proposed appropriations for the Department of Transportation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the state-